Appendix A

Response-to-Comment table

Comments from Related Departments **Page No.**

COMMENTS FROM RELATED DEPARTMENTS

No.	Comments	Responses
1.	**Development Bureau, Works Branch, Works Division 1, Commissioner for Heritage's Office, Antiquities and Monuments Office, Heritage Conservation Unit, Archaeology Sub-unit, dated 25 August 2025**	
	1. Although AMO has no in-principle objection to the proposed archaeological survey for the archaeological impact assessment, the following information should be furnished to AMO to address our comment given previously:	Noted.
	<u>Sections 4.2 and 5</u>	
	2. Our previous comment 14 refers. A thin cultural layer with archaeological potential dated to Ming-Qing dynasties likely exists in the subject site and archaeological survey is proposed. Please supplement the following:-	
	(i) within the Study Area, please demarcate **(a)** the area where archaeological potential of Ming-Qing periods and pre-historic period cannot be ruled out; **(b)** the area confirmed by previous archaeological works that no original deposit with archaeological significance has been identified; **(c)** the area outside Sha Ha SAI;	Noted, Figure 4.1 is added to demarcate the identified areas.
	(ii) to assess the archaeological potential of the areas mentioned in (i) above, in particular to verify the archaeological potential of (i)(a) within the Study Area would be higher than 'low';	Noted, the archeological potential of the identified areas are assessed in revised Section 5.1.3.
	(iii) to propose appropriate mitigation measure for the areas mentioned in (i) above;	Noted, the mitigation measures are proposed in Section 5. For area (a), archaeological survey is recommended; for area (b) and (c), archaeological watching brief is recommended.
	(iv) to provide a table to summarize the gist of (i) to (iii); and	Noted, please refer to Table 5.1 for the summary of archaeological potential, impact from proposed construction and mitigation measures for the identified areas.

No.	Comments	Responses
	(v) to revise the relevant sections where appropriate.	Noted, the relevant sections have been revised accordingly.
	<u>Section 3.2.1</u>	
	3. Our previous comments 2 & 3 are referenced here. Section 3.2.1 states that the excavation of T3, T4, and T19 did not yield any artefacts. However, the 1998 report in fact reported a cultural layer of Qing dynasty in T3 and T19. Please revise the section in accordance to the result of 1998 report and revise the relevant assessment if required.	Noted. Section 3.2.1 has been revised in accordance to the result of 1998 report in which "No artefacts were revealed in T4" and "The excavation of T3 and T19 did not yield any important artefacts."
	<u>Section 3.2.1 & Appendix B-3</u>	
	4. Our previous comment 4 is referenced here. To double check the results of T6 and T8 of the 1998 archaeological works and take appropriate reference in this assessment.	Please be advised that the Test Pit in proximity to the study area should be T6 instead of T8 after review. Related information has been added into Section 3.2.1 and Appendix B-3.
	<u>Section 3.2.3</u>	
	5. Our previous comment 11 and your RtoC are referenced here. To double check the results of 2002 survey, and revise the following description accordingly:	
	(i) to double check the artefact from 159/141. Apart from blue-and-white porcelain shards, other artefacts also unearthed from the test pits but the findings were missed in this AIA;	Noted, and revised as "159/141 which is close to 159/151 also yielded fragments of stonewares, tiles and porcelains at C001, and fragments of stonewares and brown glaze vessels as well as blue-and-white porcelain sherds at C004. However, those blue-and-white porcelain sherds were too fine to identify the type of vessel."
	(ii) Test pit 159/151 and 159/141 in Group II were reported with unearthed artefacts, but Group II was then assessed as no archaeological potential in the section. Justification is required on this assessment; and	According to the 2002 Survey report Section 6, "Group II and Group III only have only unearthed modern and contemporary ceramics, presenting no archaeological excavation value." However, the sentence has been deleted to eliminate discrepancies in interpretation.
	(iii) our previous comment 10 refers, to double check and revise the group no. of 159/141 and 179/141 on the plan at Appendix B-3.	Noted and Appendix B-3 has been revised.

No.	Comments	Responses
	Section 4.1.1 & Section 4.1.2	
	6. To double check and revise the dating of the cultural layer in T3, T4, T6, T19 in the vicinity of this subject site. The report of 1998 survey reported a Qing cultural layer (Layer 2) was identified in T3, T6, and T19.	Revised accordingly as "Qing dynasty" at Section 4.1.1 and 4.1.2.
	Section 4.1.3	
	7. To provide further justification on the dating of the cultural layer mentioned in the section, i.e. early to mid-Ming dynasty, in addition to the assessment that no B/W shards were unearthed from the test pit.	Section 4.1.3 is deleted after review. Further fieldwork is required to deepen the relevant chronological research.
	Editorial comment	
	Section 5.2.1	
	8. Our previous comment 19 and your R-to-C refer, to demarcate on a plan to show the proposed archaeological survey area.	Noted. Please refer to Figure 4.1 for the location of area (a), which has been identified as the proposed archeological survey area as in Section 5.
	9. To supplement in the section that all archaeological fieldwork should be conducted by an archaeologist who has obtained a Licence to Excavate and Search for Antiquities from the Authority under the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance, Cap. 53.	Noted and supplemneted into Section 5.2.3
	Section 6	
	10. Please check if the reference '**陳偉漢，朱海仁，張強祿，鄺桂榮，陳春麗，廖明全，... & 丁巍**. (2007). 香港西貢沙下遺址 DI 區發掘簡報．華夏考古，(4), **3-34**.' should be read as '**香港古物古蹟辦事處 、 廣州市文物考古研究所**．(2007).香港西貢沙下遺址香港西貢沙下遺址 DI 區發掘簡報區發掘簡報. 華夏考古華夏考古, (4), **3-34, 169, 171**.' Please also update on the footnotes.	Revised accordingly.
	11. To check if the reference '**方燕明，趙新平，& 張志清**．(2004). 2002 年度香港西貢沙下遺址 C02 區和 D 02 區考古發掘簡報．華夏考古，(4), **3-47**.' should be read as '**香港古物古蹟辦事處 、 河南省文物**	Revised accordingly.

No.	Comments	Responses
	考古研究所 . (2004). 2002 年度香港西貢沙下遺址 C02 區和 D 02 區考古發掘簡報 . 華夏考古 , (4), **3-47, 62**.' Please also update on the footnotes.	
	12. Our previous comment nos. 1, 20, and 21 refer, it is noted that scale and north arrow are sometimes missing in some of the plans. Please check if scale and north arrow can be added to the plans.	Noted and added accordingly.
	13. To supplement in the section that: An archaeological action plan should be provided for AMO's agreement on the details, methodology and locations of test pits/augers of the proposed archaeological survey.	Noted, and supplemented in Section 5.2.4.
	14. Factual information of archaeological background of the subject site was still found inaccurate in this revised report and the R-to-C. We would like to reiterate our previous comment 21. Please check and confirm the accuracy of the information for this assessment to ensure the validity of the assessment results.	Noted.

(Last updated 29 August 2025)